



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,065	04/27/2001	Bernhard L. Convent	STL 920000073US2	1668

7590 04/28/2006

David W. Victor
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR LLP
315 S.Beverly Drive; Suite 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212

EXAMINER

SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/845,065

Applicant(s)

CONVENT ET AL.

Examiner

Mohammad A. Siddiqi

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02/21/2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-23, 25-37 and 39-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-23, 25-37 and 39-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9, 11-23, 25-37 and 39-45 are presented for examination.
Claims 46-51 are new. Claims 10, 24, and 38 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-9, 12-23, 25-37 and 41-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diamond et al. (6,591,295) (hereinafter Diamond) in view of Anand et. al. (5,974,416) (hereinafter Anand).

4. As per claims 1, 15, and 29, Diamond discloses a method, system, and article of manufacture for enabling access to data, comprising:

receiving a call from a client to invoke a remote
interface method (111, fig 1, col 3, lines 37-52);

accessing, with a remote interface implementation (111, fig 1, col 3, lines 37-52), parameters from the received call in response to the invocation of the remote interface method (111, fig 1, col 2; lines 5-21; lines 37-59; col 3, lines 37-52);

generating a stored procedure call (col 3, lines 35-53) with the accessed parameters as input parameters (111, 112, fig 1, col 2; lines 5-21; lines 37-59; col 3, lines 37-52) of the stored procedure (111, 112, fig 1, col 2; lines 5-21; lines 37-59; col 3, lines 37-52);

transferring the stored procedure call to a stored procedure named by the call to execute (111, fig 1, col 2; lines 5-21; lines 37-59; col 3, lines 37-52); and

returning the data object to the client (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25).

Diamond do not specifically disclose receiving output from the stored procedure including multiple result sets, wherein each result set includes output from the stored procedure, inserting the received result sets from the stored procedure into a data object. However Anand do teach receiving output from the stored procedure including multiple result sets, wherein each result set includes output from the stored procedure, inserting the received result sets from the stored procedure into a data object (ADTG message contains multiple result sets generated by the stored procedures,

col 11, lines 42-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Diamond and Anand. The motivation would have been transferring tabular data over a network.

5. As per claims 2, 16, and 30, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Diamond discloses the stored procedure executes in a database server and generates the output (col 3, lines 32-35; lines 38-53) from a database managed by the database server, (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25).

6. As per claims 3, 17, and 31, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Diamond discloses processing, with the remote interface implementation, an input mapping to determine the parameters in the client call to use as input parameters to the stored procedure call (col 2, lines 1-21; lines 37-49).

7. As per claims 4, 18, and 32, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Diamond discloses receiving the stored procedure output after the stored procedure program completes execution (col 2, lines 1-21; lines 37-49; col 7, lines 43-44).

8. As per claims 5, 19, and 33, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Diamond discloses processing an output mapping indicating how the stored procedure output result sets are mapped to the data object (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25).

9. As per claims 6, 20, and 34, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Diamond discloses the, wherein the output mapping indicates an order in which the received result sets are added to the data object (elements of fig 2 and 3, col 2, lines 5-21; col 6, lines 59-67, col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25).

10. As per claims 7, 21, and 35, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Diamond discloses generating metadata describing the result sets included in the data object; and adding the metadata to the data object (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25).

11. As per claims 8, 22, and 36, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Diamond discloses processing, with the client, the metadata in the received data object to determine how to access the

stored procedure output from the data object (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25, result set and metadata).

12. As per claims 9, 23, and 37, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Diamond discloses the data object is comprised of multiple elements, wherein the result sets include rows of data, wherein inserting the result sets into the data object further comprises inserting data from each column in each row in each result set to one element in the data object, and wherein the metadata defines structure and types of data in each element (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25, result set and metadata).

13. As per claims 11, 25, and 39, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Diamond discloses the client only receives one data object with stored procedure output in response to the call (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25, result set is one data object).

14. As per claims 13, 27, and 41, Diamond discloses a method, system, and article of manufacture for making stored procedure programs available to application programs, comprising:

Generating a remote interface implementation to respond to a remote interface method capable of receiving a call from the application program including data and invoking a stored procedure in a database server with the data from the application program used as input (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; 37-49; col 3, lines 35-53); and

Diamond do not explicitly teach determining one stored procedure program generating output including multiple result sets, wherein each result set includes output from the stored procedure, needed by one application program; generating an output mapping for the remote interface implementation to use to determine how to insert the stored procedure output result sets into a data object that may be used by the application program. However, Anand do teach determining one stored procedure program generating output including multiple result sets, wherein each result set includes output from the stored procedure, needed by one application program (col 11, lines 42-53); generating an output mapping for the remote interface implementation to use to determine how to insert the stored procedure output result sets into a data object that may be used by the application program (cols 10 -12). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Diamond and Anand. The motivation would have been transferring tabular data over a network.

15. As per claims 14, 28 and 42, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 13, above. In addition, Diamond discloses the generated remote interface implementation inserts metadata into the data object providing information on the stored procedure output inserted into the data object (elements of fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25, result set is one data object).

16. As per claim 43, 44, and 45, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Diamond discloses the stored procedures executes in a database server and wherein the received output comprises output from a database, wherein the database server and the remote interface implementation are implemented on a same machine (col 5, lines 25-56), wherein the remote interface implementation performs the operations of generating the stored procedure call, transferring the procedure call, receiving the output, inserting the received output from the stored procedure, and returning the data object to the client (elements of

fig 2, col 2, lines 5-21; col 7, lines 6-12; lines 34-44; col 5, lines 1-25, result set).

17. As per claims 46, 48, and 50, claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Anand discloses wherein each result set includes a column and data type structure, and wherein at least two of the result sets have different column and data type structures (meta data and row data, col 11, lines 43-53).

18. As per claim 47, 49, and 51 claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Anand discloses receiving output from the stored procedure including at least one parameter resulting from at least one transformative operation performed on data in a database table satisfying a query condition including at least one of the input parameters to the stored procedure (elements of fig 3, col 11- 12).

19. Claims 12, 26, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diamond et al. (6,591,295) (hereinafter Diamond) in view of Anand et. al. (5,974,416) (hereinafter Anand) as applied to claim 1, 15, and 40 above, and further in view of Clegg et al. (6,356,946) (hereinafter Clegg).

20. As per claims 12, 26, and 40, Clegg discloses wherein the remote interface implementation is implemented as a Enterprise JavaBean and wherein data object comprises a Java serializable object (col 4, lines 27-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine the teachings of Diamond and Anand with Clegg. Motivation would have been transmitting a tabular data to the clients using Java programming language, which is expressly designed for use in the distributed environment of the Internet.

Response to Arguments

21. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 11-23, 25-37 and 39-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A. Siddiqi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mohammad Siddiqi
04/24/2006

John F. Hunsicker
SPC 2154
John